



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,951	04/20/2006	Brian Anderton	0380-P03923US0	8723
110 7590 03/22/2010 DANN, DORIMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307				
EXAMINER STEADMAN, DAVID J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1656				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/22/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/562,951	Applicant(s) ANDERTON ET AL.	
	Examiner David J. Steadman	Art Unit 1656	

All Participants:
 (1) David J. Steadman.
 (2) Kathleen Rigaut.
Date of Interview: 21 January 2010

Status of Application: after final rejection
 (3) _____.
 (4) _____.
Time: approximately 2 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
22, 27

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Ms. Rigaut to notify applicant's representative that the after-final amendment filed on 1/12/10 would not be entered and to explain the reasons for non-entry. The examiner noted that while the amendment to claim 22, which was the single claim discussed during the interview of 1/7/10, does not appear to require further consideration and a new search, the amendment to claim 27 would require further consideration and a new search. The examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 2/3/09 encompasses the alternative limitations a "fragment" or a "derivative" of "full length tau protein" of SEQ ID NO:2 and the 103(a) rejection is based on a fusion of full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with a polyhistidine tag as being encompassed by a "fragment or derivative of full length tau protein". However, the examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 1/12/10 is amended to delete the alternative "derivative" such that the claim is now limited to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2", which excludes a full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with the addition of a polyhistidine tail. The examiner noted that by limiting the claim to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2" in claim 27, at least a new search is required.